



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/832,387	04/11/2001	Louiss R. Jackson, JR.	COMP:0205	4526
22879	7590	03/01/2005	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			VORTMAN, ANATOLY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2835	

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/832,387	JACKSON, LOUSS R.
	Examiner Anatoly Vortman	Art Unit 2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01/10/05 (Amendment).  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10, 13-46, 48, 50, 52 and 53 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-10, 13-46, 48, 50, 52 and 53 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Amendment***

1. The submission of the amendment filed on 01/10/05 is acknowledged. To this point, claims 1, 13-18, and 37 have been amended and new claims 52 and 53 have been added. Claims 11, 12, 47, 49, and 51 have been cancelled. Thus, claims 1-10, 13-46, 48, 50, 52, and 53 are pending in the instant application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 8-10, 13-17, 20-23, 28-31, 33-38, 44-46, 48, 50, and 52, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US/5,646,819 to Hill, III (Hill).

Regarding claims 1, 21, and 37, Hill disclosed (Fig. 1-3) a computer space saving system comprising:

a personal computer (31) including a housing / enclosure defining a volume and having a plurality of computer components disposed therein (inherently, since any computer and

particularly one depicted on Fig. 2 and 3 of Hill, has a plurality of components disposed in the inner volume of the computer housing) and having a wall / upright mount structure (10, 12) configured to mount the housing (of computer (31)) on a substantially vertical surface and a display (Fig. 2) immovably secured to the housing (Hill teaches that the computer may be a notepad computer, column 2, lines 35-40. Notepads have integrated (i.e. immovable) displays / screens).

Regarding claims 2 and 3, Hill disclosed that the housing comprises a substantially flat panel having a slim thickness (Fig. 4).

Regarding claims 8-10, 22, 23, and 38, Hill disclosed a flat panel /screen display ((31) Fig. 2).

Regarding claims 13, 14, 15, 17, 28, 30, and 31, computer of Hill, inherently comprises: a processor, a motherboard, a port, a software, and a data storage device.

Regarding claim 16, Hill disclosed a battery (column 2, line 27).

Regarding claim 20, 34, and 44, Hill disclosed a mount structure (13) for mounting a housing on a substantially horizontal surface .

Regarding claim 33, Hill disclosed that said upright mount structure (12) comprises a plurality of mounting slots (Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 29, Hill disclosed a mobile power supply (34).

Regarding claims 35, 36, and 45, Hill disclosed a wall-mountable peripheral device (keyboard) (40) for communicatively coupling to a port of the housing (Fig. 2, 5).

Regarding claims 46, 48, and 50, the method steps recited in the claims are inherently necessitated by the device structure as taught by Hill.

Regarding claim 52, Hill disclosed that the display is located on a first side of the housing and the upright surface mount (10, 12) is located on an opposite side of the housing (Fig. 2, 3).

4. Alternatively, claims 21-31, 33-42, 44, 45, and 52, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by US/5,831,817 to Chang.

Chang disclosed (Fig. 1A, 1B, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B) an identical wall mounted computer (a space saving system) as recited in the claims, including receptacles for modular computer components (12, 14) and an angle adjustment assembly (34) for a display (36), which is located on one side of a housing of a computer (30). Also, a processor, a motherboard, a port, a software, and a data storage device all are inherently present in the device structure (computer) of Chang since they all are necessary components of any computer. The vertical mount (wall mount) is also inherently present, since the computer (30) is hanging on the wall as shown on Fig. (4A and 4B), said mount is located on opposite side of the computer housing.

5. Alternatively, claims 21-31, 33-42, 44, 45, and 52, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by US/5,673,169 to Wicks.

Wicks disclosed (Fig. 6) an identical wall mounted computer (a space saving system) as recited in the claims, including receptacle (34) for modular computer component (24) and an angle adjustment assembly (20) for a display (12), which is located on one side of a computer housing (16). Also, a processor, a motherboard, a port, a software, and a data storage device all are inherently present in the device structure (computer) of Wicks since they all are necessary

components of any computer. The vertical mount (wall mount, upright mount) (64) located on another opposite side of the computer housing (16) is also present on Fig. 6.

6. Alternatively, claims 21-31, 33-42, 44, and 45, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by US/6,282,082 to Armitage et al., (Armitage).

Armitage disclosed (Fig. 18A-18C) a wall mounted computer (a space saving system) as recited in the claims, including receptacles (1802, 1804) for modular computer components (1806, 1818) and an angle adjustment assembly (1812) for a display. Also, a processor, a motherboard, a port, a software, and a data storage device all are inherently present in the device structure (computer) of Armitage since they all are necessary components of any computer. The vertical mount (a cabinet) is also shown on Fig. 18A.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 4-7, 24-27, and 39-42, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill in view of US/5,331,509 to Kikinis.

Regarding claims 4-7, 24-27, and 39-42, Hill disclosed all, but that the computer housing comprises a plurality of modular bays/slots/receptacles for a plurality of compact computer

components (modular bodies) adapted for removable insertion into, and coupling with the housing.

Kikinis teaches such a modular computer (Fig. 2-4) having a plurality of modular bays/slots/receptacles (19, 21, 23, 25, 35, 37, 39, and 41) for a plurality of compact computer components (modular bodies) (like device 61) adapted for removable insertion into, and coupling with the computer housing so as to enable a user to upgrade the computer according to the demands of a particular application (see Kikinis, col. 2, lines 34-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to modify computer of Hill by providing it with a plurality of modular bays/slots/receptacles for a plurality of compact computer components (modular bodies) adapted for removable insertion into, and coupling with the computer housing as taught by Kikinis in order to enhance the modularity of the Hill's computer and to enable a user to upgrade the system according to the demands of a particular application.

9. Alternatively, claims 1-10, 13-20, 46, 48, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Chang, Wiks, or Armitage, each taken alone.

Chang disclosed (Fig. 1A, 1B, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B) an identical wall mounted computer (a space saving system) as recited in the claims, including receptacles for modular computer components (12, 14) and an angle adjustment assembly (34) for a display (36), which is located on one side of a housing of a computer (30). Also, a processor, a motherboard, a port, a software, and a data storage device all are inherently present in the device structure (computer) of Chang since they all are necessary components of any computer. The vertical mount (wall

mount) is also inherently present, since the computer (30) is hanging on the wall as shown on Fig. (4A and 4B), said mount is located on opposite side of the computer housing.

Wicks disclosed (Fig. 6) an identical wall mounted computer (a space saving system) as recited in the claims, including receptacle (34) for modular computer component (24) and an angle adjustment assembly (20) for a display (12), which is located on one side of a computer housing (16) . Also, a processor, a motherboard, a port, a software, and a data storage device all are inherently present in the device structure (computer) of Wicks since they all are necessary components of any computer. The vertical mount (wall mount, upright mount) (64) located on another opposite side of the computer housing (16) is also present on Fig. 6.

Armitage disclosed (Fig. 18A-18C) a wall mounted computer (a space saving system) as recited in the claims, including receptacles (1802, 1804) for modular computer components (1806, 1818) and an angle adjustment assembly (1812) for a display. Also, a processor, a motherboard, a port, a software, and a data storage device all are inherently present in the device structure (computer) of Armitage since they all are necessary components of any computer. The vertical mount (a cabinet) is also shown on Fig. 18A.

Neither Chang, Wicks, nor Armitage disclosed that the display is immovably secured to the housing (i.e. that the housing and display formed as one piece or a unit).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to modify each of the aforementioned references so as to secure immovably the displays to the computer housings in order to adapt devices for a particular application which does not require movable display, since it has been held that it does not amount to invention to make integral that which has therefore been in two or more parts, *In re*

*Ottoetal*, 50 USPQ 149, or forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164 (1893).

The method steps of claims 46, 48, and 50 are inherently necessitated by the device structure as taught by either Chang, Wicks, or Armitage.

10. Claim 19, 43, and 53, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Hill, Chang, Wicks, or Armitage, each taken with US/5,610,798 to Lochridge Hill, Chang, Wicks, or Armitage, each disclosed all but a plurality of the keyhole slots. Lochridge disclosed a hangable computer (Fig. 2) having a mounting for hanging (40) comprising a plurality of keyhole slots (46) in order to readily hang or remove the computer from supporting surface without the removal of holding screws (column 5, lines 10+).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to modify the mount structure of either Hill, Chang, Wicks, or Armitage by providing them with the plurality of keyhole slots as taught by Lochridge in order to facilitate hanging and removal of the device from the supporting surface.

11. Claim 18 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Hill, Chang, Wicks, or Armitage, each taken with US/5,375,076 to Goodrich.

Hill, Chang, Wicks, or Armitage, each disclosed all, but wireless communication device. Goodrich disclosed a computer system having a wireless communication device (column 4, lines 12+) for interacting with peripheral devices.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the computer art at the time the invention was made to provide said computers of Hill, Chang, Wicks, or Armitage with wireless communication device as taught by Goodrich in order to enhance convenience for a user.

***Response to Arguments***

12. The Examiner would like to remind the Applicant, that during examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. > *In re American Academy of Science Tech Center*, \_\_\_ F.3d \_\_\_, 2004 WL 1067528 (Fed. Cir. May 13, 2004) (The USPTO uses a different standard for construing claims than that used by district courts; during examination the USPTO must give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation.).

Regarding the Hill reference, Applicant's arguments regarding the unreasonable interpretation of Hill's elements are moot, since Hill has been differently applied in view of the amendments to the claims.

Regarding the remaining references, the main thrust of the Applicant's arguments is directed to the amendments to the claims, which specify that display is secured immovably. These arguments are also moot, since grounds of rejection of relevant claims have been changed from 35 USC 102 to 35 USC 103.

Regarding the Chang and Wicks references, the Applicant has also stated that neither of the references teaches "a single housing" (see Amendment, p. 21, line 1 and p. 24, third

paragraph, line 5). The examiner would like to direct the Applicant's attention to the fact that limitations "single housing" is not present in the claims. Claims are broader than argued.

Furthermore, regarding the Armitage reference the Applicant contends that the reference "discloses an assembly for mounting to a horizontal surface" (see p. 27 of the Amendment, second paragraph). To the contrary, the Armitage teaches exactly what is claimed, i.e. an assembly for mounting to a vertical surface (a wall). Indeed, as shown on Fig. 18A the vertical mount (the cabinet) is mounted to the vertical surface (to the wall) and therefore the computer is also mounted to the vertical surface (to the wall) via said cabinet.

### *Conclusion*

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anatoly Vortman whose telephone number is 571-272-2047. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, between 10:00 am and 6:30 pm..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Lynn Feild can be reached on 571-272-2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Anatoly Vortman  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2835

AV

